DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 467 EC 114 769

TITLE	Guidelines for Establishing an Outreach Program.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Committee on Public Education, Berkeley.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	32p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Minneapolis Public Schools, Special School District No. 1, Prescriptive Instruction Center, Special Education Service Center, 254 South Upton Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405 ($6.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Home Instruction; Mentally Handicapped; *Outreach Programs; Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; Parent Teacher Conferences; *Trainable Mentally Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS	*Project SEARCH (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The paper provides guidelines for establishing an outreach program to increase communication and skill development of trainable mentally handicapped students (ages 5-16 years) based on the Project SEARCH (Special Education and Related Child Health) program at the Emerson School (Minneapolis, Minnesota). Following an introduction, meetings between parents and staff, and the data recording system (for noting student progress, parent teaching time, and teacher contact time) are outlined. The organization and scheduling of home visits and parent instruction are detailed. Methods for evaluating the program's effectiveness are discussed, as well as solutions to problems that arose during the course of the project. Among the extensive appendixes are tables of outreach objectives, recording forms, guidelines for determining the amount of direct service to parents, parents' surveys, and teacher evaluation forms. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED172467

GUIDELINES FOR ESTABLISHING AN OUTREACH PROGRAM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carole Gupton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC 114769

OUTREACH

ESEA Title VI, B

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SPECIAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM SERVICES

Minneapolis Board of Education
Carol R. Lind, Chairperson
Marilyn A. Boree W. Harry Davis John M. Mason
Philip A. Olson James W. Pommerenke Jane A. Starr

Superintendent of Schools
Raymond G. Arveson

Special School District No. 1
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
An Equal Opportunity Employer

1978

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the Minneapolis Public Schools of the Office of Education.

© COPYRIGHT 1978 MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Introduction

Emerson School, located in Minneapolis, is a program for 160 Trainable Mentally Retarded students between the ages of five and sixteen. There are sixteen classroom teachers, two communication specialists, one home economics teacher, one industrial arts teacher, one adaptive physical education teacher, two social workers, one registered nurse, a one-half time occupational therapist, and a one-half time art teacher.

The majority of the students have handicapping conditions in addition to mental retardation. Approximately 25% of the Emerson population is Severely and Profoundly Retarded. Fifty-five of the Emerson students come from economically disadvantaged environments. Low income does not necessarily prevent learning, but it may present situations which interfere with progress.

The basic problem which the Emerson Outreach Project addresses lies in the area of developing procedures which maximize the learning opportunities for trainable mentally retarded students. It is apparent that acquisition of skills requires repeated instruction and application. This instruction is optimized if it occurs on a continuous rather than sporadic basis. These factors, when viewed in conjunction with the need to generalize life-skill from the classroom to "real-life" application in the home and community suggest the need for parent involvement in the instructional process.

A survey conducted among special education teachers at Emerson School in the spring of 1975 indicated that a substantial portion of children did not receive help at home on the skills being taught in school. In addition, there were even larger numbers of children for whom teachers could not determine the amount of help which was being provided at home. (Attachments A 1-3)

Despite various efforts made by the school to inform parents, it was obvious there was a need to increase communications in order to directly coordinate home-school training efforts in basic-skill areas where children were working. While parents could serve as true partners in the education of their mentally handicapped child, many have been consistently frustrated in their attempts to teach at home, due to the lack of procedures, activities, motivational strategies and emotional support.

Because of the need for cooperation teaching between the home and the school, a proposal for Title VI-B funds was written by a committee composed of Emerson teachers, social workers, the nurse and administrators.

The proposal included the addition of three professional staff persons to the Emerson School program to provide increased assistance to parents whose children attended the program. It was anticipated that the liason staff would work with classroom teachers and parents in determining needs and goals for each child, sharing school and parent expectations for the child, discussing methods, strategies and materials for the child, explaining pupil progress reports thereby promoting increased communication and understanding in both directions. These services would, in turn, result in more consistent programming for the handicapped.

The Emerson Outreach Project had two specific goals:

To create a continuous learning environment which would increase the child's skills.

To significantly increase communications between the home and the school. Three teachers, certified in trainable mentally retardation, staffed the project with the assistance of half time secretary. A fourth teacher was added during the first year. It was advantageous that Outreach staff had previous experience at Emerson. They were familiar with many of the students and parents and had already established a working relationship with the other staff members.

Each year, the Outreach teachers had a combined caseload of approximately 80 families, i.e. 20 per Outreach teacher. This number was workable in terms of the teacher's time committments and quality of work. Each teacher worked with students of varying abilities. The caseload was divided by classroom rather than geographic location of students' homes. Outreach teacher traveled to all parts of the city of Minneapolis. This allowed the classroom teacher to work with one specific Outreach teacher, thus saving classroom teacher's time.

The annual budget for the Outreach project was approximately $55,000. supported by local State and Title 6-B funds. The project operated on a nine month basis, identical to the T.M.R. School program. Teachers' salaries amounted to $48,000, clerk's salary $3,200, travel and mileage $1,400, evaluation consultant $1000, office and instructional supplies $1200, telephone $400, and other indirect costs and fringe benefits $2700. With approximately 80 students involved, the cost per pupil was approximately $685.00.

Project Development

Outreach Advisory Council

At the start of the first project year, an Outreach Advisory Council was established. The constituency of the council was: Outreach teachers, representative classroom teachers, school principal, representative parents, community agency staff and staff from the Minneapolis Special Education administration. The council assisted the Outreach teachers in providing direction and policy approval, promoting the project within the school district and community and soliciting funds from local community organizations or corporations.

The council also assisted by volunteering parent participation time to the construction of materials, contacting parents and fund raising.

In the fall of each school year, a letter was sent to each parent explaining the Outreach program and inviting them to become active participants in the program. Attached to the letter was a simple questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope. The questionnaire asked three basic questions: (Attachment B)

1. Do you want to participate in Outreach?
2. In what special areas does your child need help?
3. Would you be willing to work individually with your child at home?

If the letter was returned with a negative response to the question concerning participation, the Outreach and school staff personally contacted the parents to encourage their participation. Another important response characteristic was a "no" response under willingness to work with child, but a "yes" response regarding desire to participate. This may have indicated a fear or anxiety on the part of parents for which follow-up provided support.

Dichotomous, i.e., yes/no responses seemed the simplest and most logical to use for this questionnaire. Yet, we did ask the parents to name areas in which they'd like to work with their child. Some unique requests were elicited, e.g. shaving, riding a bike. However, the most common requests were in the areas of speech and language, self help skills, quantitative skills and reading.

Follow-up Meetings

After the application was received by the Outreach staff, the family was visited by the Outreach teacher. The purpose of this meeting was to establish rapport between Outreach teacher and family. The teacher explained the program more fully and the parents asked questions about their involvement in the project.

In the parent decided to participate in the project, the next meeting took place in school at the initial parent-teacher planning meeting. The child's individual educational plan was developed by the input of teachers, parents, other support staff and the Outreach teacher. Based on this plan, the parents and Outreach teacher decided what objectives to work on at home. Some objectives were similar to those in school, thus reinforcing what the child was learning. Other objectives were not a part of the child's educational plan and were only taught in the home with possibilities for reinforcement in school.

Data Recording System

Emerson School, as most T.M.R. programs operates on a task analyzed curriculum-base. This method of teaching and recording progress was also very appropriate to home instruction also. The system for recording progress of Outreach students involved writting specific objectives for students. writing a task analysis or developmental sequence for the objectives, devising a recording system, recording individual progress and recording progress for the total group of Outreach students.

The Outreach teachers wrote a set of objectives and task analysis for all skills being taught by parents as a part of the project. This has been continually expanded and revised. Each objective and task analysis accompanied by a chart for recording student progress. This book, Basic Skill Activities for the Retarded: A Task Analysis Approach has been published and is available for purchase. Most students and parents involved in Outreach worked on more than one objective for which there was a separate recording chart.

There was also a need, for program evaluation purposes, to record the progress of the Outreach students as a total group. Each student was assigned a number. This number remained the same for all the years the student continued in Outreach. A chart was devised that listed objectives on the left and students' numbers across the top. (Sample Attachment C.) For recording purpores, all objectives and task analysis representing large learning tasks were divided into sub-objectives which could be more realistically achieved in a school year or few months time.

Twice a year, for evaluation purposes, student progress on each objective was compiled. At the intersection of student's name and objective, a number was written in black ink at mid-year and red ink at the end of the year. In this way, it was possible to measure progress by student and across all students' progress. [illegible] coded as follows:

1. Objective achieved.
2. Currently working on this objective.
3. Inappropriate objective.
4. Student dropped from program

Occasionally an objective was dropped for several reasons. It may have been inappropriate at that time for the child, the parents may have decided that they did not wish to work on the particular task or the child may have wished to pursue other objectives; (generally older students.) Each year only about seven to eight percent of the objectives were dropped, suggesting that the procedure for objective setting was extremely reliable.

The Outreach teachers' generally recording the students' progress with input from the parents. This procedure served as a reliability check, i.e. observing the child's behavior and recording it, rather than depending solely on parent information.

Parent Teaching Time: Parents were asked to record the amount of time spent working with their children on specific objectives. Three different methods used to accomodate parents' skills and background. (Attachment D.) One form provided space for parents to record the activities they worked on and the amount of time they spent. Another form had blank lines which the Outreach teacher filled in the objectives with the parent filling in the amount of time spent on each objective per day. A third method used by some parents was a daily journal in a notebook on which they described activities and time spent working. This method usually provided the most detailed account, but had the disadvantage of being time-consuming for parents.

Parent-teaching time was also compiled for the total Outreach project at mid-year and at the end of the year. Four sample weeks are designated in each reporting period for which the Outreach teachers recorded, by student number, the amount of time the parents spent working with that child in each sample week. (Attachment E.) This data provided an indication of parent involvement.

Teacher Contact Time

Outreach teacher contact time with parents was also recorded. The length of every home visit was recorded by the teacher in a log and at mid-year and end of year, a time series analysis was done across all Outreach teachers. This was again done by choosing four sample weeks in each recording period and recording the time spent with each parent on home visits that week. An hour was the average length of a home visit. (Attachment F.)

Organization and Scheduling of Home Visits

Initially, each family was visited by an Outreach teacher on a bi-weekly basis. With 20 families per teacher, 10 home visits per week seemed a maximum number if adequate preparation was to precede each visit. This preparation consisted of communicating with the classroom teacher and other support staff, constructing or obtaining commercial materials appropriate to a specific objective and recording in the child's Outreach log after each home visit. (Attachment G.)

Time was allowed in the Outreach teacher's schedule for driving, project tasks that are ongoing, i.e., writing, purchasing and preparing materials and dissemination. The Outreach staff also assisted the school staff with special events that required additional adult supervision, i.e. field trips, Special Olympics, etc. As the role of Outreach teacher evolves in a school, it can take on many differing responsibilities.

The Outreach teacher had a flexible job schedule in order to meet the needs of the families involved. Teachers met with parents when it was convenient to their family routine. It was preferable to make home visits when the child was home from school. That meant most home visits were in the late afternoon and evening.

Parent Instruction

After the first project year, it was determined that for some parents to work adequately with their students at home, more intense assistance by the Outreach teacher was required. Home visits needed to be on a weekly basis, at least initially. In order to accomodate the families needing more frequent home visits, the Outreach teachers decided to visit other families on a three week basis, during the second year of the project.

In the third year of the project, the last year of Federal Title 6-B support, a procedure was developed to assist parents to continue instructing their children at home.

The purpose of the procedure was to enable parents to continue instructing their children at home after their association with the Outreach project was terminated. Through this gradual process, it was anticipated that parents would become more independent in designing learning activities for their children and would begin to perceive the potential educational value of many simple home activities. It was also hoped that parents would continue to instruct their children without the support and reinforcement of the Outreach teacher.

This procedure was not possible with all parents in the Outreach project. Some parents required much contact and support from Outreach or other school staff in order for them to instruct their children at home. These same parents often lacked the resources in their homes or capabilities to design educational activities for their children. But, these parents did teach their children if they had the Outreach project to provide support, instruction and the materials to do so. These were usually parents belonging to groups three and four. (Refer to Guidelines for Determining Amount of Direct Service to Parents.) (Attachment H.)

The procedure for helping parents to become self-sufficient was directed to those parents who had demonstrated the ability to consistently instruct their children at home and who had already demonstrated some creativity or independence in designing activities for their children. Usually these same parents were third year participants in the Outreach project. These parents belonged to groups one and two. (Refer to Guidelines for Guidelines for Determining amount of Direct Service to Parents.)

Outreach teachers had traditionally visited parents every two weeks. With the group one and two parents, Outreach teachers visited every three weeks or monthly. The rationale for this was to gradually phase out contact with Outreach teachers. It also allowed more time for the Outreach staff to serve group three and four. This reasoning was explained to group one and two parents.

In conjunction with the parents, Outreach teachers wrote an objective for parent achievement. This was a product oriented objective and a separate one was written for each step of the procedure to create learning materials or activities. A short written evaluation was done by the parents to determine the effectiveness of their game or activity. (Described in next paragraph.) Again the rationale for this was explained to the parents, that this was a learning process for them also to develop more skills in teaching their children. A recording was kept of parent achievment on these objectives. (Attachment I.)

The procedure for helping parents to create learning materials or activities was as follows: The Outreach teacher provided:

1. Materials and directions for assembley or set up of a game or activity. The parents are expected to independently construct and use the game or activity.
2. One or two ideas and the directions for a game or activity. The parents are expected to independently obtain the necessary materials and construct and use the game or activity. Materials required will be something usually readily available in the home.
3. Provide a book or packet of ideas for game or activities. The parents are expected to choose an appropriate game or activity, obtain necessary materials, construct and use the game or activity.
4. An example of a note from a classroom teacher describing the student's current school work. From this, the parents are expected to develop an idea for teaching this same task at home and independently carry it through with their child.

No specific motivational system was developed for parents involved in the Outreach Project. Parents did not receive material rewards or any type of token reinforcement. Rather, the child's progress on objectives and the improved relationship between parent and child was the motivator. In addition to this, the ongoing communication between Outreach teacher and parent and the friendship that developed was also considered to be a great motivating factor.

The concept of establishing a token reinforcement system for some parents who were not motivated by the above factors has been considered. The Outreach staff and others involved in the project decided that this would have to be a separate program, in that more personnel would be required to assist these parents.

Also, more funds would be required to provide reinforcers to parents.

Parents learned techniques for working with their children by watching the Outreach teachers demonstrate with the child and a specific activity. Parents and Outreach teacher discussed teaching techniques and the task analyzed method of teaching. Outreach teachers assisted the parents in planning optional teaching periods and settings in the family structure and schedule. With the assistance of the Outreach teacher, parents could devise reward systems when necessary in order to gain the child's cooperation and interest.

In most cases, a formal reward for the child could be gradually phased out in that the parents' attention and the activities themselves seemed very reinforcing to the child.

Parents also received instruction as needed on behavior management techniques for dealing with problems, behaviors that occur at home. Most instruction was related to a specific behavior on repetoire of behaviors, not a theoretical approach. The instruction and program devised was very simple and was completed informally by parents and the Outreach teacher. In other cases, a more involved structured behavior change program was written by the Outreach teacher.

The area of behavior change was the most difficulty for parents to impelement effectively; probably because of the intense emotions involved; teaching a specific skill allowed a parent to be more objective. Obviously, the two were often related, i.e. a behavior problem related to gaining the childs cooperation for working on a particular skill was alleviated when the child began to enjoy the extra attention from the parent. This required persistence on the parents part and a great deal of encouragement and concern from the Outreach teacher at the onset.

One publication has been used by the Outreach teacher to instruct parents about behavior management; Teaching Your Child, written by Dr. Lanny Moreau and produced by CEMREL, Inc., a programmed learning text written for parents. The Outreach teacher and parent worked on this text and discussed it together. The techniques used for instructing parents in behavior management must be as varied as techniques used for teaching children. It is an area where the Outreach teacher must gain the confidence of the parents and individualize the method used to fit their needs and abilities.

Parents received materials from the Outreach teacher to facilitiate teaching certain skills. There were few commercial materials available geared to the developmental levels of Trainable Mentally Retarded students. Outreach teachers used appropriate commercial materials and adapted some of them. They also constructed materials appropriate to the child's skill level and particular interests. These materials were lent to parents and a materials center was maintained in the Outreach office. Some parents devised activities or materials independent of the Outreach teacher. Parents were also lent idea books from the Outreach teacher. A book of ideas for activities cross referred to certain skill areas has been written and published. The book is entitled: Learning Games and Activities for Trainable Mentally Retarded.

Project Evaluation

Evaluation of the Outreach program's effectiveness was important. It provided documentation of student progress, program efficiency and input from program consumers. This information was used to guide the Outreach staff in program design. It also provided documentation to funding sources on how effectively funds were being spent.

An independent evaluator was employed by the Outreach project to design an evaluation system, assist in implementing it and analyze the data compiled at mid year and end of each project year.

Student progress recording on objectives has already been discussed. Parental recording also has been explained. The two other devices used for gathering data were a parent evaluation and school staff evaluation. (Attachments J. and K.)

These parent evaluations provided information to the Outreach staff on how well the current program design was meeting parents' needs. It also provided feedback to the Outreach teachers about quality of materials provided, teacher abilities in communicating with parents and suggestions for project change and improvements.

The school staff evaluation of the Outreach project was very important in that these individuals were essential to the success of the project. Without their cooperation, the communication to parents and effectiveness of the Outreach project would not have been possible. Several suggestions made by teachers for improving the Outreach project were implemented over the past three years.

Both parents and school staff have been very favorable in evaluating the project. They felt it enhanced students' learning and communication between home and school.

Problems and Solutions

As with any program, problems arose and solutions were sought, implemented and evaluated. The initial parent application process has been adapted and supplemented to encourage participation by parents who could possibly benefit from the project but do not return the application letter. Some parents of students at Emerson had reading difficulties and may not have understood the application. In these cases, the Outreach teacher or classroom teacher explained the project to the parents at their fall planning conference.

Classroom teachers may refer names of parents to the Outreach staff. If these parents had not applied, the Outreach teacher called the parent to explain the program and attempt to allay apprehensions they had about participating in program. The classroom teachers also tried to encourage participation in Outreach at the fall planning conference.

Some parents wished to participate but forget to return the application or it was lost in the onslaught of papers from school in the fall. A follow up note was sent to all parents about two weeks after the original letters had been sent.

Through these efforts many new parents participated in the program each year. Word of mouth recommendations from other parents were very effective in encouraging Outreach participation.

Many parents who had students at Emerson did not join the Outreach project the first year, and did join the second and third year.

Another problem that arose was the parent who joined the project but through their actions did not make a committment to teaching their child. This parent repeatedly cancelled home visits, appointments with the Outreach teacher, was not home for scheduled visits or did not make the effort to teach their child at home. Often these parents were well intentioned but did not have the time or desire to fulfill their requirements as a participant in the Outreach project.

During the first year of the project, a criterion for demitting families from the Outreach project was developed. (Attachment L.) This was written by the Outreach staff with input from the Advisory Council and School Social workers. The Outreach teacher made exceptions to this criterion if it was felt that the parents were making some effort at improving their participation Record keeping of time spent teaching child was important but a few parents with limited skills found it difficult to complete. Instead, they would report verbally to the Outreach teacher what they had done and the amount of time spent teaching their child.

Classroom teachers were expressing concern regarding the lack of communication from the Outreach teacher about home visits and parental teaching. This problem arose because of the scheduling of home visits. The classroom teacher had preparation time after the student left school in the afternoon, while the Outreach teachers were not in school, because they were making home visits, optimal time for them because students were at home. To alleviate this problem, a form was developed to communicate information about home visits. (Attachment M.) This was filled out by the Outreach teacher after each home visit. A copy was given to the classroom teacher and other school staff involved with that particular child.

Classroom teachers appreciated this and it helped fulfill their need for better communication. It also encouraged the classroom teacher to communicate back to the Outreach teacher because they knew the date of the next home visit.

Project Dissemination

Several tools have been developed by the Outreach staff to share the project with other Special Educators. A brochure and short project summary have been written and distributed to people, state and nation-wide. A presentation by the Outreach staff with visual aides and a sound slide show is available and has been made to many different special educators and consumer groups. The book of objectives and task analysis and an activity guide have been written and published by The Outreach staff along with these Guidelines for Establishing an Outreach Program. For further information about this project, contact Dr. Sajjad Haider at Emerson School, 1421 Spruce Place, Minneapolis, MN., 55403.

To order publications, write to:

Prescriptive Instruction Center
Minneapolis Public Schools
Special Education Division
354 Upton Avenue South
Minneapolis, Mn., 55405

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Extent of Progress of Emerson Students
(Teacher Survey May, 1975)

Skill	Making Some Progress		Not Making Progress		Don't Know		Not applicable Child is not working on this Skill		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Eating	117	87	12	9	0	0	3	2	134	100
Toileting	64	48	18	13	0	0	52	39	134	100
Dressing	93	69	19	14	0	0	22	16	134	100
Grooming	90	67	15	11	6	4	26	19	127	100
Mobility	52	39	10	7	3	2	69	51	134	100
Body Awareness	93	69	20	15	6	4	15	11	134	100
Object Manipulation	102	76	12	9	3	2	17	13	134	100
Receptive Language	115	86	13	10	2	1	4	3	134	100
Expressive Language	86	64	12	9	16	12	30	22	134	100
Behavior Problems conflicting with learning	82	61	24	18	49	37	22	16	134	100
Academic Skills	88	66	9	7	3	2	34	25	134	100
Mean	89	66	14	10	8	5	27	20	133	99

TABLE 2

Extent of Present Help with Skills at Home
(Teacher Survey - May, 1975)

Skill	Receiving help on skills at home		Not receiving help at home		Don't Know		Not applicable - child is not working on this skill		Total Responses*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Eating	55	41	30	22	46	34	0	0	131	98
Toileting	42	31	20	15	22	16	49	39	133	99
Dressing	57	43	20	15	38	28	19	14	134	100
Grooming	47	35	19	15	41	31	26	19	133	9
Mobility	21	16	17	13	28	21	68	51	134	100
Body Awareness	18	13	17	13	86	64	13	10	134	100
Object Manipulation	31	23	24	18	62	46	17	13	134	100
Receptive Language	58	43	15	11	59	44	2	1	134	100
Expressive Language	50	37	20	15	52	39	12	9	134	100
Behavior Problems conflicting with learning	39	29	24	18	49	37	22	16	134	100
Academic Skills	44	33	15	11	42	31	33	25	134	100
Mean	42	31	20	15	48	36	24	17	134	100

It appears that there is a relationship between receiving help at home and pupil progress. When the data in Tables 1 and 2 are compared, students who are receiving help are more likely to be making progress, and those not receiving help, less likely (see Table 3). The relationship between lack of teacher information on home help ("don't know" responses) and pupil progress is not clear.

TABLE 3

Relationship Between Progress and Home Help on Skill
(Teacher Survey - May, 1975)

Skill	MAKING SOME PROGRESS N	% Receiving Home Help	% Not Receiving	Don't Know	NOT MAKING PROGRESS N	% Receiving Home Help	% Not Receiving	Don't Know
Eating	117	45	17	37	14	14	71	14
Toileting	64	59	18	23	18	17	44	39
Dressing	93	61	13	30	19	0	47	53
Grooming	90	53	12	34	12	0	66	33
Mobility	52	36	23	40	10	20	40	40
Body Awareness	93	19	8	72	20	5	40	55
Object Manipulation	102	29	17	53	12	8	58	33
Receptive Language	115	30	6	51	13	0	61	39
Expressive Language	86	56	16	36	12	17	33	50
Behavior Problems Conflicting with Learning	82	44	15	41	25	8	48	44
Academic Skills	88	16	16	36	9	22	11	66
Mean	89	45	14	41	14	9	48	43

Attachment A-1

Minneapolis Public Schools
EMERSON OUTREACH PROJECT
1421 Spruce Place
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403

September 7, 1977

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you want to participate in Outreach in 1977-78?

Yes_____No_____

2. In what special areas does your child need specific training?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Would you be willing to work individually with your child on his/her special needs with Outrea guidance?

Yes_____No_____

4. Would you be interested in serving as a member of the Outreach Parent Advisory Council?

Yes_____No_____

Child's Name_____

Parent's Name_____

Telephone_____

Address_____

Child's teacher_____

Attachment C

OUTREACH OBJECTIVES (Sample of one page)

Objectives Breakdown
According to Skills

STUDENTS' NUMBERS

A. COMMUNICATION

1. Visual Memory
2. Visual Perception
3. Bliss Symbols
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
4. Sign "yes"
5. Shake head "yes"
6. Sign "no"
7. Shake head "no"
8. Sign name
9. Sign alphabet
10. Sign objects
    a.
    b.
    c.
    d.
11. Sign situation
    a.
    c.
    d.
12. Make a sound
13. Name objects
    a.
    b.
    c.
14. Verbalize "yes"
15. Verbalize "no"
16. States first and last name
    a.
    b.
17. Identify self
18. State address

RECORDING:

	SUN.	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	FRI.	SAT.

	SUN.	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	FRI.	SAT.

	SUN.	MON.	TUES.	WED.	THURS.	FRI.	SAT.

Attachment D-2

CHILD'S NAME _____

TASK: _____

	TIME SPENT	WHAT YOU DID
MONDAY		
TUESDAY		
WEDNESDAY		
THURSDAY		
FRIDAY		
SATURDAY		
SUNDAY		
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		

Parent Time

Parent/Student Number:_____

Week 1_____

Week 2_____

Week 3_____

Week 4_____

Parent/Student Number:_____

Week 1_____

Week 2_____

Week 3_____

Week 4_____

Parent/Student Number:_____

Week 1_____

Week 2_____

Week 3_____

Week 4_____

Parent/Student Number:_____

Week 1_____

Week 2_____

Week 3_____

Week 4_____

1st Sample Week (Dates)

Home Visit 1 _____

Home Visit 2 _____

Home Visit 3 _____

Home Visit 4 _____

Home Visit 5 _____

Home Visit 6 _____

Home Visit 7 _____

Home Visit 8 _____

Home Visit 9 _____

Home Visit 10 _____

Second Sample Week (Dates)

Home Visit 1 _____

Home Visit 2 _____

Home Visit 3 _____

Home Visit 4 _____

Home Visit 5 _____

Home Visit 6 _____

Home Visit 7 _____

Home Visit 8 _____

Home Visit 9 _____

Home Visit 10 _____

Third Sample Week (Dates)

Home Visit 1 _____

Home Visit 2 _____

Home Visit 3 _____

Home Visit 4 _____

Home Visit 5 _____

Home Visit 6 _____

Home Visit 7 _____

Home Visit 8 _____

Home Visit 9 _____

Home Visit 10 _____

Fourth Sample Week (Dates)

Home Visit 1 _____

Home Visit 2 _____

Home Visit 3 _____

Home Visit 4 _____

Home Visit 5 _____

Home Visit 6 _____

Home Visit 7 _____

Home Visit 8 _____

Home Visit 9 _____

Home Visit 10 _____

HOME VISIT LOG SHEET

Attachment G

Date _____

Time _____

OBJECTIVE(S)

MATERIALS: _____

COMMENTS/PROGRESS

Guidelines for Determining Amount of Direct Service to Parents

Each parent will be assigned a number, based on the criteria listed below:

1. Parents seen once a month. For parents who have been in program for three years.

2. Parents seen once every three weeks. For parents who have been in program for two years.

3. Parents seen every two weeks. For parents new to program, or other parents who need more direction.

4. Parents seen as often as necessary (at least weekly) -- These are parents in special situations.

These guidelines are not followed strictly. Each family and the needs of the parents and student varies. Allowance is made for these differences.

Outreach Recording on Parent Objectives

Attachment I

Parent #

Objective 1 - Given materials and directions for a game or activity, the parent will independently construct and use the game or activity.

Objective 2 - Given 1 or 2 ideas or directions for a game or activity utilizing materials from the home, the parents will obtain the necessary materials, construct and use the game or activity.

Objective 3 - Given a book or packet of ideas for games or activities, the parents will choose an appropriate game or activity, obtain materials, construct and use the game or activity.

Objective 4 - Given a note from the classroom teacher describing a child's activity, the parent will design a game or activity for teaching this at home.

Parents could meet objectives 1 or 2 by purchasing appropriate toy or game referred to or demonstrated by Outreach teacher.

Parents could meet objectives 3 or 4 by purchasing appropriate toy or game not specifically mentioned by Outreach teacher.

Objective 1 - Yes_____No_____

Objective 2 - 1 2 3 Not completed_____
Not well constructed very well constructed

Objective 3 - 1 3
Not appropriate very appropriate Not completed_____

Objective 4 - 1
Not appropriate 2 3
very appropriate Not completed_____

Comments:

1. Please circle the word which best describes your feelings toward the Outreach Program.

   1 Bad 2 Poor 3 O.K. 4. Good 5. Excellent

2. Is the Outreach Program helping your child's learning ability? Yes____ No_____
   If yes, how has your child benefited?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Is the Outreach Project helping your child develop more appropriate behaviors?
   Yes_____ No_____
   If yes, what behaviors have improved?_____

   _____

4. Is the Outreach Program helpful to you? Yes_____ No_____
   If yes, how has it helped you?_____

   _____

   _____

5. Does the program interfere with your normal home activities? Yes_____ No_____
   Do the benefits to you and your child make up for the interference?

   Yes_____ No_____

6. Do you spend more time with your child now than you did before the project began? Yes_____ No_____

7. Have you taught your child anything new as a result of the project?
   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, please list:_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. Do you feel you could and would teach your child as you have without the Outreach Program? Yes_____No_____

9. Could the program be improved? Yes_____No_____

If you answered yes, what do you think should be changed?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Circle the word that best describes the teachers in the program?

1	2	3	4	5
Bad	Poor	O.K.	Good	Excellent

11. Circle the word that best describes the materials you've been given to work with your child.

1	2	3	4	5
Bad	Poor	O.K.	Good	Excellent

12. Circle the word that best describes your child's reaction to the program.

0	1	2		4	5
No Reaction	Bad	Poor	O. .	Good	Excellent

COMMENTS:

_____
Signature (If you wish)

Minneapolis Public Schools
Emerson School
1421 Spruce Place
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403

January 23, 1978
Title VI - "Emerson Outreach"

T E A C H E R E V A L U A T I O N

1. Do you feel the Outreach Program is helping participating children in your room? Yes_____No_____

2. Does this program interfere with your normal teaching routine?
Yes_____No_____
If yes, do the benefits of the program outweigh the inconvenience?
Yes_____No_____

3. Do you receive positive feedback about the Outreach Program from participating parents? Yes_____No_____

4. Please express suggestions for improvement.

Title VI - "Emerson Outreach"

CRITERION FOR DEMITTING FAMILIES FROM EMERSON OUTREACH PROGRAM

1. Non-response upon repeated attempts to set up appointments with family.

2. Consistent cancellation of appointments by family.

3. Consistent absence from home when Outreach teacher arrives at pre-specified time.

4. Consistent non-participation in teaching child specific objectives or recording-keeping over a period of several months (parent enjoys visits of Outreach teacher but fails to work with child.)

PROCEDURES:

Regarding Numbers 1, 2, and 3 above:

1. Send letter to parents:
   a. explaining long waiting list.
   b. giving one more opportunity to become involved.

2. Have letter approved and signed by school principal.

Regarding Number 4 above - during the home visit:

1. Outreach teacher emphasizes need for parent to teach child and keep records.
2. Outreach teacher asks if parent is still interested in the program.
3. If response to Number 2 is positive, teacher gives parent a specific time interval. During that time the parent must make an effort to teach the child and keep records. If no effort is made by the parent, Outreach teacher informs parent they will be demitted from the program. A letter will be sent to this effect and approved and signed by the Outreach teacher and school principal.
4. If response to Number 2 is negative, Outreach teacher informs parent they will be demitted from program.

Attachment V

Summary of Outreach Visit

To: Date:

From:

Child's Name:

Materials brought:

Comments regarding visits:

Next visit:

If you have comments or questions, please let me know before the next visit.